

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

## PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY  
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/002398

International filing date (day/month/year)  
13.02.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)  
27.03.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
G06F17/22, G06F17/27

Applicant  
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION

**1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:**

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

**2. FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 56.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

**3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.**

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - Gitschiner Str. 103  
D-10958 Berlin  
Tel. +49 30 25901 - 0  
Fax: +49 30 25901 - 840

Authorized Officer

Triest, J

Telephone No. +49 30 25901-431



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITYInternational application No.  
PCT/EP2004/002398

---

**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

---

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
  - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:
    - ☐ a sequence listing
    - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:
    - ☐ in written format
    - ☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:
    - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
    - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
    - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/002398

---

**Box No. II Priority**

---

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

- ☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
- ☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	2-6,9-10
	No: Claims	1,7,8
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	5-6
	No: Claims	1-4,7-10
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-10
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING  
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/002398

**Re Item I.**

The examination is being carried out on the **following application documents**:

**Description, Pages**

1-17 as originally filed

**Claims, Numbers**

1-10 as originally filed

**Drawings, Sheets**

1/2-2/2 as originally filed

**Re Item V.**

1

The following documents are referred to in this communication:

D1 : FR 2 826 753 A (CANON KK) 3 January 2003 (2003-01-03)

2

**INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1**

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1 discloses (the references in parenthesis applying to this document):

a method for optimizing tag based protocol stream parsing (*cf. page 4, lines 8-11*), using a reference tag table comprising at least one tag and a corresponding function name (*cf. page 4, lines 12-16*), said method comprising, each time a tag is read from

said tag based protocol stream (*cf. page 4, lines 19-20*), the steps of:

- comparing said read tag and the tags of said reference tag table and (*cf. page 4, lines 21-22; fig. 1, step E21*),
- if said read tag belongs to said reference tag table, determining if a function name is associated to said tag belonging to said reference tag table (*cf. page 4, lines 23-25*) and,
- if a function name is associated to said tag belonging to said reference tag table, executing the function corresponding to said function name associated to said tag belonging to said reference table (*cf. fig 1, step E29*).

These are all the features of present claim 1 which is thus not new.

#### **DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-4, 7-8**

Dependent claims 2-4 and 7-8 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT), the reasons being as follows:

Claims 2-4: Attributes to tags are well known and part of most markup languages. It is thus obvious, to include them as additional options in said reference tag table. As attributes are normally used as parameters it is also not inventive to use their values as parameters for said functions in said reference tag table.

Claims 7-8: The additional features of claims 7-8 are also disclosed in D1 (*cf. page 3, lines 15-23*). They are thus not new.

#### **DEPENDENT CLAIMS 5-6**

Dependent claims 5-6 relate to specific functions that allow the parser to skip or save in memory a determined amount of data.

These features are not disclosed in the prior art and therefore novel.

The problem solved by these differentiating features is to enable systems to interpret arbitrary large files within given memory constraints.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING  
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/002398

None of the available prior art discloses or suggests to do this in a manner as described by the differentiating features. Therefore, claims 5-6 are inventive.

**INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 9-10**

Independent claims 9 for a system and 10 for a medium refer back to claim 2.  
Thus, the same reasoning as above applies.